



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/680,119	10/04/2000	Andrew Sinclair	13768.163	7800

22913 .7590 10/01/2004

WORKMAN NYDEGGER (F/K/A WORKMAN NYDEGGER &
SEELEY)

60 EAST SOUTH TEMPLE
1000 EAGLE GATE TOWER
SALT LAKE CITY, UT 84111

EXAMINER

LEROUX, ETIENNE PIERRE

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2171

DATE MAILED: 10/01/2004

9

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/680,119

Applicant(s)

SINCLAIR ET AL.

Examiner

Etienne P LeRoux

Art Unit

2171

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 April 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-40 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) 27-32 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-26 and 33-40 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 29 April 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

Claims Status:

Claims 1-40 are pending. Claims 1-26 and 33-40 are rejected. Claims 27-32 are allowable.

Allowable Subject Matter:

Claims 27-32 include allowable subject matter. The following is an examiner's statement of reasons for allowance:

Claim 27 is allowable for including the following conditions that if the fired event is a synchronous event, then suspending client access to the item, providing complete control of the item to the application logic wherein the application logic executes and if the application logic does not abort, resuming client access to the item and committing the item to the store and if the fired event is an asynchronous event, then committing the item to the store and calling the application logic, wherein the application logic does not have complete control of the item.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Art Unit: 2171

Claims 1, 3-8, 10, 11, 13-17, 20-23, 25, 26, 28, 29, 33, 35-38 and 40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by US Pat No 5,892,909 issued to Grasso et al (hereafter Grasso).

Claims 1, 15 and 33:

Grasso discloses:

- registering application logic with events that abstract the plurality of different protocols [Fig 15, 1535] from the application logic such that client communication using any of a plurality of different protocols can cause the application logic to execute, wherein one or more events that are to cause execution of the application logic are defined [CRA module 1520, Fig 15, col 26, lines 28-40]
- detecting the occurrence of one of the defined events, the defined event occurring as a result of client communication using one of the plurality of different protocols [col 26, lines 10-27]
- executing the registered application logic to manipulate an item in the store in response to the occurrence of the defined event [col 26, lines 48-60]

Claims 3, 16, 28 and 35

Grasso discloses wherein the defined event is one or more of saving an item, deleting an item, copying an item, moving an item, modifying an item, starting a mail database, stopping a mail database, and an expiration of a timer [col 18, lines 23-48].

Claims 4, 17 and 29:

Grasso discloses wherein the act of detecting the occurrence of one of the defined events comprises the act of detecting when a client performs one of the act of saving the item within the

Art Unit: 2171

store; the act of deleting the item within the store; the act of copying the item within the store; the act of moving the item within the store; and the act of modifying the item within the store [col 4, lines 28-37]

Claims 5 and 22:

Grasso discloses wherein the defined event is a synchronous event [automatic response col 4, lines 38-46]

Claims 6 and 36:

Grasso discloses the act of calling the registered application logic for the synchronous event before committing the item to the store [col 6, lines 57-65].

Claims 7 and 37:

Grasso discloses wherein the registered application logic receives complete control over the item [col 7, lines 15-30]

Claims 8 and 38:

Grasso discloses the act of committing the item to the store after the registered application logic executes [col 7, lines 27-30]

Claim 10:

Grasso discloses wherein the act of detecting the occurrence of one of the defined events comprises receiving client communication in accordance with one of the plurality of protocols abstracted by the store events [col 26, line 61 – col 27, line 14]

Claims 11 and 23:

Grasso discloses wherein the act of executing the registered application logic comprises the act of committing the item to the store after the event object executes [col 7, lines 27-30]

Art Unit: 2171

Claims 13 and 25:

Grasso discloses wherein the event is an asynchronous event [col 7, lines 45-50]

Claim 14:

Grasso discloses wherein the event object is an asynchronous event object, and wherein the asynchronous event object is called after the item is committed to the store [col 7, lines 45-50].

Claim 20:

Grasso discloses the act of providing the event object with control of the item further comprises the act of passing the item to the event object [col 11, lines 40-53]

Claim 21:

Grasso discloses wherein the act of providing the event object with control of the item further comprises the act of passing a pointer to the item to the event object [col 31, line 61-col 32, line 5]

Claim 26:

Grasso discloses wherein the asynchronous event is called after the item is committed to the store [col 7, lines 40-55].

Claim 40:

Grasso discloses wherein the act of registering application logic with store events that abstract the plurality of different protocols from the application logic comprises the act of registering application logic with store events that abstract HTTP, SMTP and MAPI from the application logic [col 12, lines 45-55].

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 2, 18, 19, 30, 34 and 39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Grasso in view of Pub No US 2003/0140112 issued to Ramachandran et al (hereafter Ramachandran).

Claims 2, 18, 19, 30, 34 and 39:

Grasso discloses the elements of claim 1 as noted above.

Grasso fails to disclose wherein the act of registering application logic comprises the act of registering application logic with store events that abstract the plurality of different protocols from the application logic and that are related to at least one folder within the store.

Ramachandran discloses wherein the act of registering application logic comprises the act

Art Unit: 2171

of registering application logic with store events that abstract the plurality of different protocols from the application logic and that are related to at least one folder within the store [par 29]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Grasso to include a folder within the store as taught by Ramachandran for the purpose of providing users the means for sending, retrieving, and saving messages in a storage server [Fig 1, 14]. The ordinarily skilled artisan would have been motivated to improve the invention of Grasso per the above so that users can participate in an electronic messaging system using special purpose Internet protocols such as POP, IMAP, SMTP and others [par 29].

Claims 9 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Grasso in view of US Pat No 6,397,352 issued to Chandrasekaran et al (hereafter Chandrasekaran)

Claims 9 and 24 :

Grasso discloses the elements of claims 1 and 5 as noted above.

Grasso fails to disclose the acts of aborting the registered application logic and failing to commit the item to the store.

Chandrasekaran discloses the acts the acts of aborting the registered application logic and failing to commit the item to the store. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Grasso to include the acts of aborting the registered application logic and failing to commit the item to the store as taught by Chandrasekaran for the purpose of rolling back a transaction [col 12, lines 59-64]. The ordinarily skilled artisan would have been motivated to improve the invention of Grasso per that above so that messages received when the destination site

Art Unit: 2171

detects that a communication link with the source site has failed can be deleted because the information is not accurate.

Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Grasso in view of US Pat No 5,621,892 issued to Cook (hereafter Cook).

Claim 12:

Grasso discloses the elements of claim 1 as noted above.

Grasso fails to disclose the act of calling a second application logic, wherein the second application logic has lower priority than the application logic, and wherein an event source passes the item to the second application logic.

Cook discloses the act of calling a second application logic, wherein the second application logic has lower priority than the application logic, and wherein an event source passes the item to the second application logic [col 7, line 45- col 8, line 10]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Grasso to include application logic comprising a first priority and a second priority as taught by Cook for the purpose of creating alert generator logic for registering and issuing alerts associated with a particular application or a particular processing node [col 7, lines 45-50]. The skilled artisan would have been motivated to improve the invention of Grasso by including application logic comprising priority levels so that the following alerts can be distinguished: 1) an information alert, 2) an normal alert, 3) a major condition alert, and 4) a critical condition alert [col 7, lines 55-65].

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 4/29/2004 with respect to claims 1-40 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Etienne LeRoux whose telephone number is (703) 305-0620. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday – Friday from 8:00 AM to 4:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Safet Metjahic, can be reached on (703) 308-1436.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

Patent related correspondence can be forwarded via the following FAX number (703) 872-9306

Etienne LeRoux

9/30/2004



SAFET METJAHIC
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100